UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,

Plaintiff

v.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

 $11\parallel$

14

19

FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE GROUP, INC., et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:21-cv-00996-APG-DJA

Order Denying Motion to Stay, Denying Motion to Supplement, and Denying as **Moot Motion to Strike**

[ECF Nos. 6, 43, 47]

Defendants Fidelity National Title Group, Inc. and Fidelity National Title Insurance Company moved to stay the case pending the Ninth Circuit's ruling on Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Fidelity National Title Ins. Co., case number 19-17332. ECF No. 6. While the motion was 12 pending, the Ninth Circuit issued its ruling in that case and the mandate has issued. I therefore 13 deny the motion to stay as moot.

The defendants thereafter filed a supplemental motion to stay the case, this time based on 15 a similar case pending before the Supreme Court of Nevada, *PennyMac Corporation v. Westcor* 16 Land Title Insurance Company, case number 83737. ECF No. 43. Plaintiff Wells Fargo Bank, 17 N.A. moves to strike the supplemental motion as not compliant with the Local Rules. ECF No. 18||47.

I deny the supplemental motion to stay. See Lockyer v. Mirant Corp., 398 F.3d 1098, 20|| 1110 (9th Cir. 2005); Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936). The opening brief in 21 the case before the Supreme Court of Nevada is not due for another 60 days. Thus, it is likely a 22 stay would be lengthy while the briefing is completed, the matter is set for oral argument, and a 23 decision is rendered.

The more expeditious, efficient, and just resolution of this case counsels in favor of completing discovery rather than staying the case entirely. Dispositive motions are not due until August 17, 2022. ECF No. 37. While the parties may want to revisit a stipulation to stay at that point depending on the progress of *PennyMac* before the Supreme Court of Nevada, a complete stay of the case at this time is unwarranted. Because I deny the supplemental motion to stay, I deny the motion to strike as moot.

I THEREFORE ORDER that the defendants' motion to stay (ECF No. 6) is DENIED.

I FURTHER ORDER that the defendants' supplemental motion to stay (ECF No. 43) is

I FURTHER ORDER that the plaintiff's motion to strike (ECF No. 47) is DENIED as

DATED this 13th day of January, 2022.

ANDREW P. GORDON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE